

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SC 9990)  
United States Attorney

MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)  
Assistant United States Attorney

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 535-5056  
FAX: (408) 535-5066  
Susan.Knight@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

\*E-FILED - 3/22/07\*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
RYAN ALEXANDER and  
CHARLES ALEXANDER,  
  
Defendants.

No. 07-00043 RMW

STIPULATION AND []  
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

On March 12, 2007, the undersigned parties made an initial appearance before the Court in the above-captioned matter. At the hearing, Assistant United States Attorney Susan Knight explained to the Court that the government had turned over all discovery to Joshua Bentley, who represents Ryan Alexander, and Jonathan McDougall, who represents Charles Alexander. AUSA Knight also explained that the parties have had some preliminary conversations about the case and need additional time to further those negotiations. The parties then requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from March 12, 2007 until April 19, 2007. The defendants', through their respective counsel, agreed to the exclusion. The parties agreed and

1 stipulated that an exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendants' need for effective  
2 preparation of counsel.

3 SO STIPULATED: SCOTT N. SCHOOLS  
4 United States Attorney

5 DATED: 3/12/07 /s/  
6 SUSAN KNIGHT  
7 Assistant United States Attorney

8 DATED: /s/  
9 JOSHUA M. BENTLEY  
Counsel for Ryan Alexander

10 DATED: /s/  
11 JONATHAN D. MCDUGALL  
12 Counsel for Charles Alexander  
13

14 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded under the Speedy Trial Act  
15 from March 12, 2007 until April 19, 2007. The Court finds, based on the aforementioned  
16 reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best  
17 interest of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial. The failure to grant the requested  
18 continuance would deny both defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective  
19 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage  
20 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18  
21 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

22 SO ORDERED.

23 DATED: 3/22/07

*Ronald M. Whyte*  
24 RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge  
25  
26  
27  
28